

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 6-11, 13-15 and 19-26 are pending in the present application.

Claims 1, 2, 6-15 and 19-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,564,548 to Dobbins *et al.* ("Dobbins") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,687,830 to Hayes *et al.* ("Hayes").

Claims 10, 11, 23 and 24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Dobbins in view of Hayes and U.S. Patent No. 6,311,820 to Hallas Bell *et al.* ("Bell").

Claims 12, and 16-18 have been cancelled.

Claims 1 and 14 have been amended.

It is respectfully submitted that no new subject matter has been added.

Reconsideration of claims 1, 2, 6-11, 13-15 and 19-26 herein is respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 6-11, 13-15, and 19-26 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Dobbins in view of Hayes.

Claim 1 has been amended to recite the feature of:

developing for each of the money items under test, a transformed money item signal with a value that is a function of the value of the money item signal and at least one variable parameter that is a function of the fraud attack acceptability criterion.

Claim 1, emphasis added. Dobbins does not teach or otherwise suggest this feature. Dobbins describes a method for the acceptance and rejection of coins. Dobbins, abstract. In Figure 5 of Dobbins, coin signals X_1, X_2, \dots, X_m are compared with values $Cntr_1 \dots Cntr_m$ effectively to transform the signals from the $X_{1,2,3}$ coordinate system shown in Figure 4 to the coordinate

system X_1, X_2, X_3 . The resulting signals Δ_1 to Δ_m are compared with upper and lower limites in step 506. This is carried out for each successive Δ value i , which is incremented at step 508. Through this pre-analysis, it is determined whether the value falls within any one of the window limit regions C_a, C_b, C_c , shown in Figure 4 that correspond to acceptable regions for true coins. When the values of Δ are found to fall within one of the regions C , it is then checked against a look up table for the region concerned at step 510 and if present, the coin is accepted at step 512.

Thus, Dobbins' step 506 is in effect a pre-screening process to determine which of the acceptance window spaces C shown in Figure 3 is likely to be relevant for the coin measurement vector concerned (*i.e.*, to determine which window is to be used in the comparison process.) Thereafter, based on the pre-screening, the vector analysis in step 510 is performed to determine whether to accept or reject the coin. Nothing in Dobbins, however, teaches or otherwise suggests the feature of "**a transformed money item signal with a value that is a function of the value of the money item signal and at least one variable parameter that is a function of the fraud attack acceptability criterion.**" Claim 1 (emphasis added).

Nor does Hayes teach this feature. Hayes discloses a system in which time varying deviations in the circuits are compensated. There is no teaching or suggestion in Hayes of "**a transformed money item signal with a value that is a function of the value of the money item signal and at least one variable parameter that is a function of the fraud attack acceptability criterion.**" Claim 1 (emphasis added). For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 and Claims 2, 6-11, and 13 that depend from claim 1 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dobbins in view of Hayes.

Claim 14 discloses substantially similar features as claim 1 and recites “a transformed money item signal with a value that is a function of the value of the money item signal and at least one variable parameter that is a function of the fraud attack acceptability criterion.”

Claim 14 (emphasis added). Because the combination of Dobbins in view of Hayes does not teach or otherwise suggest these features of claim 14 for the reasons discussed above in regard to claim 1, applicants respectfully submit that claim 14 and claims 15, and 19-26 that depend from claim 14 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dobbins in view of Hayes.

The Examiner has rejected claims 10, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Dobbins in view of Hayes and Bell. Claims 10 and 11 depend from claim 1. As explained above, neither Dobbins nor Hayes teach or otherwise suggest the feature of “a transformed money item signal with a value that is a function of the value of the money item signal and at least one variable parameter that is a function of the fraud attack acceptability criterion.”

Claim 1 (emphasis added). Nor does Bell, which describes a coin validator that is calibrated by inserting a calibration key to produce a calibration value of signals as a function of the individual characteristics of the validator. Bell, abstract. There is no teaching or suggestion in Bell of “a transformed money item signal with a value that is a function of the value of the money item signal and at least one variable parameter that is a function of the fraud attack acceptability criterion.” Claim 1 (emphasis added). For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 1 and Claims 2, 6-11, and 13 that depend from claim 1 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Dobbins in view of Hayes and Bell.

The Examiner has rejected claims 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Dobbins in view of Hayes and Bell. As explained above, neither Dobbins nor Hayes teach

or otherwise suggest the feature of **"a transformed money item signal** with a value that is a function of the value of the money item signal and at least one variable parameter that is a **function of the fraud attack acceptability criterion."** Claim 14 (emphasis added). Nor does Bell, which describes a coin validator that is calibrated by inserting a calibration key to produce a calibration value of signals as a function of the individual characteristics of the validator. Bell, abstract. There is no teaching or suggestion in Bell of **"a transformed money item signal** with a value that is a function of the value of the money item signal and at least one variable parameter that is a **function of the fraud attack acceptability criterion."** Claim 1 (emphasis added). For these reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 14 and Claims 15, and 19-26 that depend from claim 14 are not unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) by Dobbins in view of Hayes and Bell.

Applicants : Kevin Charles Mulvey
Appl. No. : 10/538,685
Examiner : Mark J. Beauchaine
Docket No. : 20305-4003

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all claims now pending (1) are in proper form, (2) are neither obvious nor anticipated by the relied upon art of record, and (3) are in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited at the earliest possible date. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would be useful in moving the application forward to allowance, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at (650) 614-7660. If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 15-0665.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: March 3, 2010

By: Sanjeet K. Dutta
Sanjeet K. Dutta
Reg. No. 46,145

Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP
4 Park Plaza, Suite 1600
Irvine, CA 92614-2558
Telephone: 650 614-7660
Facsimile: 650 614-7401
Customer Number: 34313